

7005  
2121

# A REPLY

TO  
A REPLY  
"CONSIDERATIONS AND ARGUMENTS,

PROVING THE NECESSITY OF AN

INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT LAW,

BY JOHN CAMPBELL."

32  
BY THOMAS ADAMSON.

NEW-YORK:

PUBLISHED BY BARTLETT & WELFORD,

MR. No. 6 ASTOR HOUSE.

1844.



## A REPLY

"CONSIDERATIONS AND ARGUMENTS PROVING THE INEXPEDIENTCY OF AN INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT LAW, BY JOHN CAMPBELL,"

THOMAS ADAMSON.

As I hold every man bound to give a reasonable excuse for challenging the attention of the world by putting his thoughts in print, I must state the reasons which have induced me to come out in reply to John Campbell, on the subject of an International Copyright Law.

I met a well-meaning gentleman a day or two since, who told me he had just scratched his name off of a petition to Congress on the subject of copyright. I asked him what had induced him to do so strange a thing, and he replied, that he had been reading John Campbell's pamphlet on the subject, and was convinced that it would be inexpedient to pass a law which would deprive the poor of the refined luxury of good books. As I had not seen John Campbell's prodigious pamphlet, I went immediately in pursuit of a copy, for I profess to have some sympathy for the poor myself, being one of that large class, and I had no desire to advocate a measure that would deprive me of my chief solace in trouble, my unfailing source of instruction and amusement, and the main hope of my children's happiness. And if John Campbell could offer any arguments to prove that an international copyright would do this, I felt it my duty to give him a respectful and grateful hearing. I read his pamphlet. At first I laughed at the absurdity of John Campbell, and then I blushed at John Campbell's meanness. I blushed that

any countryman of mine could be guilty of avowing such thievish thoughts, and I blushed with indignation that John Campbell should have the hardihood to insult this great and generous nation by offering no higher than mercenary motives to influence them in deciding upon a question of mere right and wrong.

John Campbell modestly calls his pamphlet, "Arguments proving the Inexpediency of an International Copyright Law," but I must assure John Campbell that his meagre and sinister statements, which he calls arguments, prove nothing in the world but his own want of capacity to argue this important question. This zealous person, in the cause of the poor, I am informed, is a paper-dealer; probably his practical knowledge in the statistics of rags may have given birth to his philanthropy for the wearer of them. I do not intend the slightest disrespect to John Campbell on the score of his profession; I am a trader myself and have no disposition to foul my own nest; and if I had judged of the potency of his arguments by their effect on my own reason, I should never have thought them of sufficient consequence to allude to them even in conversation; but I find that they have operated on the minds of others with disadvantage to the cause of truth and honesty, and fearing that some others may chance, from lack of thought, to be influenced in a like manner, I have been induced to make this reply to John Campbell's "Arguments proving the Inexpediency of an International Copyright Law."

John Campbell makes a very improper statement in regard to a mere matter of fact in the first page of his pamphlet which he is inexcusable for doing. He says: "Our American authors, in conjunction with the agents of foreign writers and publishers, have again urged upon Congress their unfounded claims."

The only petition presented to Congress in regard to this matter, was one signed by the chief publishers and booksellers in the Union. No foreigner, nor the agent of any foreigner, signed it, or was instrumental in its being presented. It was the act of American citizens, who asserted no claims of any kind, but simply asked of Congress a law that should give security to publishers for the large capital employed in their business, and enable Ame-

rics written to compete even-handed with the foreigners who now furnish the mental aliment of our countrymen. Nothing more was asked, except an act of justice to American authors and American publishers.

The Address of the Copyright Club, to which John Campbell then alludes, was not published, as he asserts, to set forth the pretensions of this position, but for a very different purpose: to call the attention of the American public to this subject, as a moral question in which the highest interests of the country are involved, and to induce the people to reflect on it, not as a matter of immediate pecuniary interest, but as one which affects the morals and liberties of the country. With the merits of the Address I have nothing to do. But let them be high or low, it strikes me as the height of impudence, (and if any body knows of any gentleman who has reached a higher point I should be glad to hear of it,) for the author of "Considerations and Arguments proving the Inexpediency of an International Copyright Law," to chatter about the "defects of style and the weakness of the arguments," of an Address signed by William C. Bryant and Francis L. Hawks, two of the best prose writers in our language.

"How then, can so petulant a production be expected to induce Congress to shut the book of knowledge to millions, in the idle hope of replenishing the pockets of a few writers and still fewer publishers?" says John Campbell. This honest paper-dealer betrays the secret of his thoughts continually. He cannot get above the "pocket." His eyes are riveted by some charm to that part of our human habilitments. It is the "pocket," the pocket, which John Campbell cannot prevail upon himself to forget. How dare you, John, to stigmatize the purely moral Address of such men as compose the Copyright Club, and above all, of such men as signed their address, as to speak of it as a mere pocket memorial? I am ashamed of your want of decency.

"In the absence then, of the doubtless far abler Senatorial Report, to which we can unfortunately but allude, it was deemed advisable to reprint an essay, published when the previous application was before Congress, setting forth the evils that would inevitably flow from the enact-



ment of an international copyright law. The renewed effort renders this imperative, and it is highly gratifying since the experience of two years has but confirmed the facts formerly stated.

It appears, then, that these "Considerations and Arguments proving the Inexpediency of an International Copyright Law," were given to the world two mortal years ago, and they are now imperatively reprinted, "highly gratifyingly" so indeed in answer to a puerile production, which was not then in existence. Modest John! Notwithstanding the imperativeness of the thing, and the "highly gratifyingness" of it; it is done "in the absence of the doubtless far abler Senatorial Report to which we can unfortunately but allude." I regret myself that I cannot have the benefit of the Senatorial Report, but I must confess that I do not believe that it was one half so amusing as these Arguments of John Campbell, and therefore my regret is not without some mitigation.

I must here state what I understand to be the main point contended for by the greater part of those who desire an international copyright. But mind, I speak only my own sentiments, although, as far as I have observed, I hold them in common with the great body of friends of this cause.

The right of an author to the control of his own works is universally conceded; but Christian nations, or rather law-making nations, have thought proper to limit the duration of this right; why they should do so, is not necessary for me to question now, the right is conceded, and has always been maintained as inherent and natural; the welfare of society requires its acknowledgment, and the plainest dictates of reason exact it. This principle then, so universally acknowledged, we have no right to apply partially; if we acknowledge it at all, we must allow of its application to all mankind. We have no right to say that the citizens of our own country shall be protected in the exercise of this right of authorship, while we deny it to the citizens of France and England, any more than we have to allow our citizens to rob from Englishmen and Frenchmen, while we prohibit them from robbing our own countrymen. It matters not what

the nature of the property may be to which we have a right, if it is taken from us our loss is positive; whether it consists of the materials which compose a book, or its binding, or its words, about good or its evil, or its value. Some part of our citizens, then, looking upon the subject of authorship in this light, ask for just laws in regard to it. Satisfied that the same principle which governs every other case will govern in this, and that what is right can never be inexpedient or unprofitable. Evil never can produce good. They who do the wrong will suffer the wrong. It is not a question of profit, of negotiations between governments, of booksellers' profits, or of the insolent claims of foreign authors. The petitioners for an international copyright law ask for this thing as a right; they are not only anxious to see their country take another step towards that perfect condition to which they believe they are entitled freedom of their laws, but they ask it that the country may avoid the evils which every wrong must produce. There are many men among us of great talent, great lives, and patriotic feelings; men whose councils have influenced the nation in other matters; who advocate this cause; who have petitioned for it to Congress, and urged cogent arguments in its favor. But John Campbell stretches out his hand like a monstrous prophet, as he is, and scatters his "Arguments proving the Inexpediency of an International Copyright Law;" and here are his "Arguments," printed two years ago, and now "imperially" and "highly gratifyingly" printed again. To illustrate the prices which the public would have to pay for English books, protected by an American statute, a few examples will suffice," says honest John. The publication price of the Pickwick Papers, illustrated, in England is \$5 00. The same work published here at \$2 00. D'Israeli's Amenities of Lit. 10 00. 1 76. Jay's Morning Exercises, 15 00. 1 00. Hannah More's Life, 6 00. 1 50. Turner's Sacred History, 10 00. 1 35. Southey's Poetical Works, 15 50. 3 50.

It is said that figures never lie, but John Campbell has the knack of making them utter lies that would put a tumbstone out of countenance. Every body, who has any knowledge of the book trade, knows very well that the causes which influence the prices of books in America and England, are irrespective of copyright. The cases cited by modest John prove nothing. The Pickwick Papers were published in England in a style very different from the edition published here; they were elegantly illustrated by spirited etchings from original drawings; they were published on much better paper, and were better bound and better printed; and large as the sale of them was there, it was larger here, and of course they could be sold at a less price. The charge for advertising in England is a very important item in the cost of a new book, very much larger than it is with us; there are taxes and an excise on almost all the materials of which a book is composed, which are unknown with us. Had the authors or proprietors of either of these works been allowed a copyright here, a fair edition would have been issued, and doubtless would have been sold at even a less price than they were by our own publishers, who had to charge in the price of their books for the risk they ran of being undersold by an inferior edition.

"It needs no argument to prove," continues John Campbell, "that at such rates, literary productions must be confined to the wealthy, and those consequently, in the more humble walks of life, will be debarred from that enjoyment which at present is conveyed to them in successive numbers through the weekly press, at \$3 a year, or carried to their doors at 40 or 50 cents the volume." But I differ with John. I think it does require an argument to prove that "that enjoyment which at present is conveyed to those in the more humble walks, in successive numbers, must be confined to the wealthy." However, as John can have no argument to offer, I shall not insist, but let me ask John Campbell, what right he or any other man, whether in humble or exalted life, has to demand that the enjoyment of Sharon Turner's life long labors should be furnished to him in successive numbers at \$3 a year, or be brought to his door at 40 or 50

costs the volume. How many years of study, how many deprivations, how many hours of wasting thought do you think Sharon Turner endured in producing that enjoyment which you would take from him without giving him even your thanks in return? But I have a suspicion that this is a question which John is not qualified, by his own literary labors, to answer; so I shall make no pause for a reply. But, notwithstanding that Turner's Sacred History is sold in England at the extravagant rate of \$10, the profits of his books have not made him rich, and his government have given him a pension to supply the wants which the income from his writings failed to do. But what right have we to any of these books enumerated by John Campbell, unless we pay the author whatever price he chooses to put upon them, whether it be ten dollars or a hundred dollars? Are not his time, his talents, his learning, his own? and shall he not be allowed the privilege of using them as he sees fit? If we can take from him the fruits of his labor without paying him the price that he puts upon them, may we not also take from his neighbor, some paper-dealing John Campbell, his stock of foolscap and letter paper? For my own part, I see no particular necessity that any poor man, or rich man, has for D'Israeli's Amenities of Literature, or Southey's Poetical Works; and I doubt exceedingly whether they will be found in any poor man's house in the country. I have never met with them in the houses of any of my poor relations, neither can I boast of being the possessor of them myself. Have we not the Bible, and Shakspeare, and Milton, and Bacon, and Fielding, and Addison, and Swift, and a host of others? and have we not Cervantes, and Lesage, and Moliere, and Goethe, and a host like them, from the Continent, free of charge? What nonsense, is it not then, John, for you to talk of depriving those in the more humble walks of life, of that enjoyment which is conveyed to them in successive numbers? To be candid with you, John, as poor an opinion as I have formed of you, from reading your "Arguments Proving the Inexpediency of an International Copyright Law," I do not think so meanly of you as to believe that you have any faith in your own doctrines.



"It has, however, been argued," continues John Campbell, "that our American authors can be substituted, and their works take the place of foreign productions. In answer to this, we have but to state facts, which we think will prove that this will not be the case, for it is no disparagement to American writers to say, that like those of other countries, one, and generally the chief object of their labors, is pecuniary compensation;" here again John has his eye upon the pocket; and I am compelled again to differ with this excellent dealer in paper, in giving it as my opinion that it is a great disparagement to American authors to say that the chief object of their labors is pecuniary compensation. It is a thought that none but the reverse of a liberal mind would ever engender. "Take the following as examples, which are American copyrighted works of the highest merit, and ought to be read by every American who values the literary reputation of his own country.

Spark's Life of Washington,	-	-	\$4 50
Bancroft's United States, 3 vols.	-	-	6 50
Irving's Columbus, 3 vols.	-	-	7 50
An inferior edition,	-	-	3 50
Prescott's Ferdinand & Isabella, 3 vols.	-	-	7 50
Stephens' Travels in C. A., 2 vols.	-	-	5 00

"Now it certainly requires no reasoning to prove," continues our immaculate John, "that the prices of these works place them beyond the reach of the middling and poorer classes, nor is the case different in the lighter department of literature, and in works of poetry or fiction—the range of prices in all being equally high."

Now it certainly does require a good deal of reasoning to prove modest John's assertions. He very well knows that all who have time and a disposition to read books, can obtain all that a reasonable man could desire. That in all parts of the country there are libraries and book clubs, from which very costly works may be obtained on the payment of a very inconsiderable sum. There is a library in our city containing 20,000 vols., for the use of which, for a whole year, only two dollars is required. That our district school libraries furnish as much wholesome reading as those who have occasion to resort to them

ever require, free of cost. But if these opportunities were not afforded to the poorer classes of society, have they any better right, I ask again, to deprive the author of the fruit of his labors than the mechanic or farmer? MUST BOOK-MAKERS BE EXCLUSIVELY TAXED FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE POOR? With what face can this paper-dealer assert of the six authors whom he has named above, that the chief object of their labors was pecuniary compensation? If it was, they were asses for their pains, for I doubt not, that with the exception of Irving, either of them would have earned more if he had employed his time as a scribe, than he has by the production of the book named. Indeed, the prices of these works, when we consider the labor which they cost, the actual outlay of money required in gathering the materials necessary for their composition, and the bodily danger incurred, are so inconsiderable as to forbid the thought; they fill me with admiration for their zeal and high motives in devoting their time, their health their talents and their substance for the benefit and honor of this country. Yet these are the men, and others who are striving to emulate them, whose destruction John Campbell demands of the American people that their places may be filled by foreign authors at a cheaper rate; and he professes to be influenced in his *Algerine Arguments* by a regard for the poor!

"Thus, Irving's and Cooper's novels," continues John Campbell, "are published at two dollars, while those of James and Bulwer are sold at one fourth the price—and so on how far soever the comparison may be extended." Any boy in the street would laugh at the wild absurdity of such a misstatement as this. It is perfectly well known to every body, John Campbell included, that all of Cooper's late works have been sold at twenty-five cents a vol.: as to Mr. Irving's novels, I should esteem it a favor if the distinguished writer of these "*Arguments*" would name them, and when and where they were published at two dollars.

Our author next quotes some thieves' arguments, from the speech of a Mr. Geary, on Sergeant Talsford's bill, whereby his own views are sustained, and himself prodigiously gratified to learn the fact, that Wordsworth having

outlived the duration of his copyrights, his works are published "at one pound four shillings; whereas the complete poetical works of Cowper, containing more matter, but in which the copyright has expired, are published in one neat volume at five shillings." It has been said by some bold writer that there never was a Jack without a Jill. My heart misgave me when I commenced John Campbell's "Considerations and Arguments," that he would prove an exception. He proves the truth of the saying in a remarkable manner. Mr. Geary and John Campbell are the Chang and Eng of reasoners.

"From the facts and arguments which have been presented, it is evident," says our John, "that an International Copyright Law will do much injury to the American public, and if such be the case regarding the community at large, the question next arises, can we justly anticipate that exception will occur to this widely spread mischief?"

Begging John Campbell's pardon in the most respectful manner conceivable, I would beg leave to observe that his facts are few in number, and of no possible bearing upon the subject, and that the arguments which he alludes to have not yet made their appearance; I must, therefore, take the liberty to differ with him in his deductions. His question is a very formidable one, and being of the Malaprop school of reasoners, he answers himself in refutation of all his previous assertions, disproving in the most ingenious manner in the world, all his arguments and considerations, and insisting that an international copyright, so far from benefitting American authors, would, on the contrary, effectually annihilate the entire brood, by making English books so cheap, that a native one could never be printed. "To the conclusions which have now been established, and to the facts from which these conclusions have been deduced, no direct reply can, we conceive, be made," says John in a triumphant paragraph. It is he that says it, notwithstanding the "we," and I am happy at last to have found one little spot where I can work by the side of our pleasant friend, instead of going in an opposite direction to him, as I have been compelled heretofore to do. I fully agree with John, that no direct reply can be made to his considerations; for in order to do that, it would be ne-

cessary to understand them, which is clearly impossible from his taking both sides of the question. There are eight or ten pages more of 'argument' in John's pamphlet, intended, as it appears, for the enlightenment of members of Congress, to whom I suppose it has been sent. Although these contain many rare men, which might prove entertaining to the public, they would lose something if transplanted from their congenial soil, and I must content myself with referring the public to the pamphlet itself, which I can assure them is full of amusement. Indeed the entire thing is worthy to become a standing jest. The excellent Campbell thus closes his admirable pamphlet, "Behold, then, the 'simple justice' of Mr. Dickens—and simple it is in this respect, at least—that such justice can be hoped for from none save very simple personages."

These simple personages consist of about nine-tenths, perhaps more, of the cultivated intellects of the country, who have viewed this subject in all its aspects, and now ask as a simple act of justice to all classes of our own country, to the national honor, and the cause of humanity, the passage of a law that will insure to foreign authors the control of their own property, and to Americans the bare privilege of competing on their own soil, even handed with foreign intellects.

One thing is very sure; no harm can come to the interests of American authorship from the passage of an international copyright law. They are already reduced so low, that it is impossible to sink them deeper. The only serious objection that can be urged against international copyright, is the mercenary plea that it will have a tendency to increase the prices of foreign books. But this is an idle apprehension. The effect would be the reverse. An international copyright, by giving a greatly increased sale for English publications, would reduce the price of them at home, and enable the author to publish them here, on terms as low as they are now reprinted; or, at least at prices which would put them in the reach of the poorest person who might desire them; and it would insure to the American public a class of works at reasonable prices, which can now only be obtained through the agency of an importer, at very exorbitant rates. There are many scien-



tific works which are never republished here, which are more essential than all the narratives and poems that England has produced for the last century, they are works, too, which are required by young mechanics, and poor professional students, who may lack the means to import them, and look for them in vain in our libraries. These works, if their proprietors were secure from underselling, could be reprinted here, at prices very far below those which they cost to import them. But the boasted cheap republications are solely for the benefit of the rich and indolent, who now purchase books which before they obtained from circulating libraries. I had occasion a few months since, to order an elementary treatise from London, through an agency here, and the cost of the work when it reached me was treble what similar works are published at in this country. It was a work that no publisher would risk the re-publication of without being secured from underselling; and therefore those who were compelled to obtain it had to pay treble the price for it that they should have done. Much boasting has been made of Alison's History, the original price of which was ten times that of the republication. But this and many similar works which are reprinted here might as well, for all the service they do our people, have remained at the original price, although it never could have been republished here, except at a very great reduction, for reasons already stated.

The existing conditions of our copyright laws does unquestionably enable the reading public to become possessed of a certain class of books, such as novels and rambling essays, at rates a trifle less than they would be able to do, under an international copyright law; but this difference in price of these wholly unnecessary works, is not an equivalent for the greater price that we are compelled to pay for scientific books, that are indispensable in the education of our youth, and the improvement of our country, all really important and desirable works that emanate from the English and Continental presses, cost us infinitely more than they would do under an international copyright law. Many works that should be largely circulated among us, are only known here by reputation. One of the

most valuable works published in England during the last two years, valuable to a nation like ours that is all the time employed in erecting houses and bridges, is *Orisk's Encyclopaedia of Architecture*. It is the most comprehensible and reliable work on the subject ever published, and should be in every library and village lyceum in the country. But the cost of it here is 15 dollars. Could the author reprint it here, he could sell it at one-third the sum. I was at a book auction, a few nights since, where the catalogue consisted chiefly of English publications; the prices at which books sold filled me with amazement. Some octavos of 3 or 400 pages brought 8 and 10 dollars. They were not bought by dandy collectors for the sake of their embellishments, but by poor looking students, and hard handed mechanics; one young man in a short jacket and a red shirt, bid 12 dollars for *Nicholson's Dictionary*. If any particulars are demanded in regard to the exorbitant rates which we are compelled by our present copyright law, to pay for good foreign books, I will only point to the numerous houses in New-York, Philadelphia and Boston, whose main business is the importation of foreign books, to the tariff of duties on printed matter, and to the thriving condition of those who act as importing agents. Mr. Campbell gives it as his opinion that American authors would derive no benefit from the privilege of copyrighting their books in England and France, but he gives us no reason therefor. That American authors would derive very great benefit from an international copyright, is beyond all cavil. I have before me a London bookseller's advertisement, in which are included thirty-five American books, at prices double those for which they are sold here; and it is the advertisement of a cheap publisher, too, Mr. Thomas Tegg, who has accumulated a great fortune by republishing books as soon as their copyright expires. The American author whose works are worth republishing, would not only have the English market at his command, but the English Colonies, Canada, the East and West, which are daily growing in consequence; there would also be the French market, from which one of our authors, at least, would derive nearly as great an income as from his own country. But the benefit to the American author would arise from the

equally feeling which he would be placed upon with the British writer, whose productions are poured upon us like an avalanche, which overshadow and bury up all the efforts of American writers, which usurp the place in the affections and thoughts of our people, that should and could be filled by those of indigenous growth. The great prevalence of foreign books among us is no evidence of their superiority to American works, but only of their great cheapness. But it is not my intention to advocate this measure as due to American writers, but as one due to the American people, to its 17,000,000 of intelligent minds now inhabiting our territory, to the incalculable millions of which our population will be composed before many years have passed, to whose independence and moral health a native literature is indispensable as native grain is for the health and freedom of the body.

Under the existing condition of our literature, no man whose productions would be likely to prove acceptable to the public would ever dream of devoting his time to literary pursuits, without some other reliable means of support, than the sale of his writings would secure. Authorship with us must be an elegant recreation of the wealthy; and the longings of our active intellects, the young and the vigorous, will be administered to by aliens and strangers. The minds of our youth, our future governors and law makers, will be moulded and fed by men who are strangers to our soil, and enemies of our system of government. Instead of America dictating by her mind to the rest of the world, and aiding all mankind to arrive at the state of equality and happiness which we now enjoy, she will herself, by giving up the direction of her intellect to other nations, become piebald in her principles, and her practice a mere parody of her system. And for what reason shall we submit to this? For no other, as Mr. Campbell professes, but that we may have the unspeakable privilege of reading the Pickwick Papers at one quarter of the price which it costs a Cockney. This is the sole good which Mr. Campbell, and others who argue with him, pretend can arise from the present state of our copyright law. But this argument amounts to nothing. It is entirely untrue. To show the absurdity of such reasoning, one circumstance

alone is enough. Messrs. Greeley & McClure, purchased the copyright of Farabee's Travels, and published a profitable edition at twenty-five cents; the same work has been republished in London, free of copyright, at a guinea! The system of cheap publication having been firmly established in this country by an enterprising publisher, to whom the public are under infinite obligation, its advantage is so apparent that it can never be abandoned; and but little difference is made in price between those works that are copyrighted and those that are free. A comparison of prices between the English and American publications affords hardly any evidence of their relative cheapness. It is probable that the London publisher of Farabee's Travels, will clear less money than the American, even though his price is twenty times greater than ours. The evil of which the friends of American copyright complain, is not one of the let alone kind; no wrong ever comes right of itself, and this is one that grows larger and bigger every day. The legislation required to destroy it may at any time be applied, but the evils that delay produces cannot be abated by the power that may destroy their cause. The shattered constitution will remain long after the fever has been driven from the body, soon will be. No disrespect has been intended in any remarks towards the Honorable Senator who reported adversely to a former petition on this subject. Doubtless, he would have offered dignified and apparently just reasons for the opposition of himself and his colleagues to the petition; and cannot but esteem it unfortunate for himself and the country, that the Senate did not require an explanation of the motives which influenced them. It is very evident that the Senate did not consider the subject of any importance, perhaps it was regarded as a personal affair of Dickens, as some of our John Campbells, in and out of Congress, profess to view it. But the petition now before Congress, and those about to be presented, are signed by the best intellects in the country; not only by men who have seemingly no personal interest in the matter, but by many whose names must command at least respect; if it should be deemed just by our Representatives, to deny their request, they must, at least, feel themselves called upon to state their reasons for so doing. Let



these reasons be what they may, I trust, for the honor of the nation, that they will not favor of John Campbellism; and that something better than mere pecuniary motives will be given for their action in a question of morals.

It needs but a very slight acquaintance with the book trade, and my own has been picked up while purchasing a few books for my own use, to discover the fallacy of ascribing the cheapness of our publications to the absence of an international copyright. The most important of our cheap publications have been either old books which never had been copyrighted, or those of which the copyright had expired, and original publications, of which the latter in many cases were republished in England, at prices greatly exceeding their cost here. The book market of the United States is the most extensive in the world, and were there no other causes, this alone would make books cheaper here than elsewhere. The popular English novels, of which editions are printed by our publishers ranging from 30,000 to 50,000, are rarely printed in editions exceeding 1500 in England. It was stated in an English Magazine that Bentley, (the great publisher of fiction,) agreed to pay Harrison Ainsworth a certain sum when the sale of one of his most popular novels (Rookwood, I think) reached 5000, and though several years had passed since its publication, it had not yet done so, and the author had received nothing for his labor.

During the months of November and December last, there were published in London 244 new books, not including magazines, annals, and reviews; of these, nine only have been, or probably ever will be, republished in this country, and of these nine, one was Sidney Smith's letters about repudiation; one, Dickens' Christmas Carol; another Charlotte Elizabeth's little story about little lace runners, and the rest of about similar importance to our welfare. But of the remaining 235 books, mostly historical, educational, and scientific, one hundred have been imported by one house alone, the average price of which is three dollars forty-three cents per volume. Yet they include none of the costly illustrated gift books, which would raise the average price much higher. These books were imported by men who are perfectly familiar with the literary wants

of the country, who would no more import books for which they could not find purchasers, than an importer of cutlery would order goods sent to our market. When we consider the great number of institutions of learning among us, the constantly increasing circle of students and readers, the greater extent of popular intelligence in this country than in Great Britain, it cannot be doubted that any work which may safely be printed in London, may more safely be republished here; if it can be done without risk of being undersold by cheaper editions. The effect of an international copyright, then, would be to reduce the price of these 100 necessary books, from three dollars forty-three cents per vol. to less than half that amount. The extra price which we are compelled to pay from the want of an international copyright for books that are indispensable, exceeds a dozen times the saving, attributed to the same cause, on the cost of many of the republished books, which so far from being indispensable, are of a positive injury to the country.

Is it then of greater importance that our novel-reading idlers should get their books at a cheap rate, or that our artists, engineers, lycées, colleges, and reading mechanics, should do so? In short, must our industrious and intelligent poor, our artists, engineers and architects, pay double prices for the books requisite in their education, that effeminate loungers, the denizens of bar-rooms, and boarding-school girls, may read the Jack Sheppards and Jack Hinton of English literature at a shilling a volume, or, as John Campbell more elegantly expresses it, "have that enjoyment conveyed to them in weekly numbers, at \$3 a year?"

Novel reading always was cheap enough. Indeed, much too cheap. The circulating libraries used to furnish all the new books worth having, and vast many that were not, at a sixpence per week. What better do our cheap publications do now? The only difference is, that once we hired books cheaper than we now are compelled to buy them.

The only class of our citizens who receive any benefit from our present copyright laws are the novel readers. And the benefit to them is very doubtful. The sacrifices

I cannot conceive it possible, that any sane mind warmed by one single spark of patriotic feeling, should hesitate to give a decided support to the cause of an international copyright. Neither the north-eastern boundary question, the Oregon question, or that most tremendous of all national questions, the duties on brass knuckles, involve principles of such moment to the welfare of this nation, as this very matter of an international copyright law, which John Campbell has disposed of in a manner so summary, and so "highly gratifying" to himself. Nothing more is needed to inculcate a right feeling on this subject, than a little thought free from all personal and mercenary motive.